なるパートナーシップ形成にいささかでも寄与できればと心より願う次第である。

追記　本目録の刊行に際しては、L.C 職員始め多くの方のご支援があった。殊に、スミエ・ジョーンズ教授・ヘレン、ポー氏・本田正静氏・日本国文部科学省・東芝国際財団に深く感謝申しあげる。

BOOK REVIEWS

Marius B. Jansen, ***The Making of Modern Japan***, by Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2000. 871 pp. + prefatory material 14 pp. Hardcover $35.00; ISBN 0-674-00334-9. Paperback $18.95; ISBN 0-674-00991-6.

©Barry D. Steben, National University of Singapore

Professor Emeritus Marius Jansen passed away on December 10, 2000, but to crown a lifetime of distinguished publications, he left the world this book as his parting gift. It is indeed fortunate that in spite of failing eyesight, he was able to complete it—and to see it published one week before his death. In spite of the very reasonable price of both the paperback and hardcover versions, its size will likely discourage its use as a textbook in all but the most ambitious courses on early modern and modern Japanese history. But for the very same reason, it is sure to be used for many years as a reference and resource tool by both students and scholars interested in various topics in Japanese and East Asian history. Each of the twenty chapters can serve in its own right as a manageable reading assignment on a particular aspect of early modern or modern Japanese history, and there is no lack of fresh perspectives based on recent scholarship as well as Jansen's distinctive Sino-Japanese research background. In 871 pages, needless to say, Jansen is able to give a much fuller treatment of the rise of modern Japan than any book of standard textbook size.

Jansen is a past master at writing narrative history, and his account frequently has the power to grip the reader and make history come alive through the people who actually lived it, at times with the aid of their own words. The first two paragraphs present a highly vivid, yet concise, description of the battle in 1600 that ended Japan's medieval age and laid the foundation for four centuries of great cultural creativity. A major reason for the particular vividness of the description here is that Jansen is describing a pair of Tosa-school screens depicting the battle, screens that Ieyasu presented to his adopted daughter as part of her dowry. The story of a momentous historical event that took many thousands of lives is encapsulated by a Tosa-school master painter on sixteen panels, and then encapsulated again by a Princeton-school master wordsmith in about 500 words.

The narrative progress here from representation to historical event to interpretation, and then back to historical event and representation, is a good symbol for the task that Jansen has set himself in this book—to cover the rise of modern Japan comprehensively by alternating between descriptions of events and socio-political structures, descriptions of cultural and artistic movements, quotations of written representations of these events and cultural phenomena by both European and Japanese contemporaries, and summaries of some recent interpretive perspectives. While the book, though gigantic, remains highly readable to the general reader and the university student, most scholars of Japan—unless they are extremely widely read—are also likely to find facts and perspectives that they were previously unaware of among its pages.

In the preface Professor Jansen gives an interesting intellectual autobiography in which he explains the reasons why his generation had to pursue breadth in their scholarship and teaching and take up all kinds of different topics of inquiry. As an attempt to synthesize and summarize the results of half a century of his own research and that of his students and successors in the field, the present work follows in this same tradition. Inevitably, due to the very comprehensiveness of the book and its concern for narrative readability, specialists in particular areas of early modern or modern Japanese history are likely to find certain

lacunae or defects in the treatment of their own area of research, as well as an insufficient representation of the scholarly controversies that have animated recent scholarship in that particular area.

In my own area of research, for example, a few long-lived historical "myths" or oversimplifications created by interschool polemic rivalry in the Edo period but exposed by recent scholarship are reproduced uncritically. In the chapter "Education, Thought, and Religion," for instance, we are told that Yamaga Sokō (1622–1685) was "an immensely influential teacher; the forty-seven *rōnin* considered themselves followers of his strategy," and that Sokō was the chief originator of the concept and ideology of *bushidō*. However, the scholarship of Hori Isao (*Yamaga Sokō*, 1959) and John A. Tucker has long since demonstrated that (1) the form of gentlemanly Confucian *shidō* 士道 that Sokō taught was diametrically opposed to the violent revenge ideology expressed in the vendetta of the Akō *rōnin*, whose leader Ōishi Kuranosuke (1659–1703) was an adolescent when Sokō was living in Akō under indefinite bakufu-imposed exile (not as a teacher) for publication of the *Seikyō yōroku* 聖教要録; (2) the only evidence for the old story that Ōishi's and his band's beliefs that culminated in the vendetta were inspired by Sokō's strategic teachings are polemic statements to that effect by Satō Naokata and Dazai Shundai in their essays condemning the *rōnin*'s vendetta (written ca. 1705 and 1731–33 respectively), and Shundai's attribution of the same view to his teacher, Sorai; (3) although Sokō had a considerable following in Edo for about a decade before his banishment, during and after his almost ten years of banishment in Akō domain (arranged by Hoshina Masayuki, the patron of Yamazaki Ansai in Edo and a devout follower of Ansai's understanding of Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism), his influence greatly diminished. According to Tucker, after the *rōnin* debate, there are few references to him or his writings—apart from the teachings of the hereditary Yamaga school itself, which disappeared from Edo in the mid-eighteenth century—until Yoshida Shōin began to extol his ideas in the 1840s; (4) Sokō's image as the systematizer and propagator of the concept and ideology of *bushidō*, while not without some foundation in Sokō's writings, is largely a creation of Inoue Tetsujirō's book *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku* (1902) and his subsequent writings on *kokumin dōtoku*.

On page 198, we are told that Sorai "was one of those consulted in the case of the forty-seven *rōnin*, and it was his proposal for the middle path of *seppuku* for the *rōnin* that eventually carried the day." However, the most thorough study of the controversies surrounding the Akō *rōnin*, Tahara Tsuguo's *Akō shijūroku shi ron* (1978), on pp. 65–69, has examined this tradition and found it unreliable. It is true, he notes, that Sorai was respected by Tsunayoshi, and was a retainer of a person whom Tsunayoshi had promoted to *karō* rank, so that his opinion *could* have been conveyed to the highest authorities. However, Tahara shows that the documents that claim that Sorai's opinion in effect decided the case, including the *Giritsusho* (擬律書) supposedly written by Sorai, are unreliable and conflict with other historical records. Yoshikawa Kōjirō also finds no evidence that the *Giritsusho* was written by Sorai. That the idea that Sorai's opinion was accepted and followed by the bakufu should have gained acceptance, however, demonstrates that Sorai's philosophy came *later* to be identified with the legalistic position of the bakufu regarding the judgment of the *rōnin* case. Large portions of the primary documents relating to the debate over the Akō *rōnin* are included in volume two of the new revised and much expanded *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, and their impending publication will do much to clear up these questions. Ironically, Professor Jansen was originally slated to serve as co-editor of this source book with Professor de Bary, but the deterioration of his health made that task impossible to fulfill.

The Akō *rōnin* vendetta was not, of course, the first *rōnin* plot in the Edo period. On page 118, Jansen discusses the anti-bakufu *rōnin* plot led by Yui Shōsetsu uncovered in 1651 and then mentions the raffish *kabukimono* of early Edo times. He then states that "In later years some of the most popular theatrical pieces served to commemorate this spirit of resistance and gave theatergoers the vicarious thrill of watching daring supermen who supposedly stood for justice and challenged authorities. This was also true of the *rōnin* plot, which was immortalized in seventeenth- and eighteenth century plays." I am not a

specialist in Edo-period drama, so it may be *my* knowledge that is insufficient here, but I have never heard of Yui Shōsetsu's plot being celebrated in plays, and no matter how much it might have been disguised by being set in another time period, I cannot imagine that such a celebration would have been tolerated by the bakufu.

There are a few other minor errors and one not-so-minor omission in the area of intellectual history. On page 90, for instance, we read about the colloquial Chinese commentary on the Six Maxims, *Rikuyu engi* 六諭衍義, which, through the translation and explication work of Sorai and Muro Kyūsō, became a textbook of popular ethical education in Japanese schools. But here the origin of the Six Maxims is attributed to the first emperor of the Qing. It was, of course, the first emperor of the *Ming* who first promulgated the maxims, although the *Rikuyu engi* itself *was* written in the early Qing. Again, on page 207, we read that Motoori Norinaga taught that, "To succumb to innovations that had been introduced into the Japanese language together with Chinese characters was to lose the 'pure Japanese heart' (*yamatogokoro*) in favor of an 'errant' *magokoro* …" Can the *magokoro*, by definition, ever be "errant"? Is the word Jansen is thinking of here not, perhaps, *karagokoro*? As for omissions, a great historian, *kanbun* writer, and calligrapher whose history, *Nihon gaishi* (An Unofficial History of Japan), was instrumental in forging the national consciousness and imperial loyalism that led to the Meiji Restoration and the rise of modern Japanese nationalism in the Meiji period, Rai San'yō (1780–1832), has inexplicably been left entirely out of Jansen's account of "the making of modern Japan," at least to judge from his absence in the index. To fill this lacuna, the reader may wish to consult this reviewer's recent study of San'yō's philosophy of history and its impact in bakumatsu and Meiji Japan in *East Asian History*, No. 24, December 2002, pp. 117–170.

Such occasional omissions, inherited inaccuracies, or slips, however, detract little from the descriptive richness of the book as a whole, which abounds with fascinating and eye-opening accounts of various aspects of early modern and modern Japanese society, politics, economy, and culture. The third chapter, "Foreign Relations," which places early modern Japan in its international context in relation to Europe, Southeast Asia, and East Asia, is particularly rich in factual and documentary detail that is missing from most standard textbooks and reference books on early modern Japan. Some of the details and nuances found in the analyses of the Tokugawa state, society, status system, economy, communication system, and popular culture may compel us to revise certain established conceptions or oversimplifications about Tokugawa Japan that we have been taking for granted for years. Due to space limitations and the focus of this journal, I will defer comment on the second two-thirds of the book that deals with modern, as opposed to early-modern, Japan, except to say that the accounts of the "Meiji Revolution" and the building of the Meiji state are written with great vigor and confidence, making them very much worth reading not only by students, but also by those of us who are already very familiar with this period.

In conclusion, this book is an excellent summation of a lifetime of path-breaking historical scholarship that itself continues to push forward the frontiers of our understanding of early modern and modern Japan. It falls into a humanistic tradition of history defended eloquently by writers such as Jacques Barzun and Keith Windschuttle, who deplore the intrusion of social science theory, literary criticism, or an obsession with quantification into the historian's craft. Accordingly, readers may sometimes feel swamped by an endless stream of historical details with insufficient theoretical anchors to help them make sense of the whole story. Thus readers who can draw some theoretical perspectives from their own or other disciplines may find this book even more useful as a resource book than those who cannot. I will not attempt to answer the question of whether this is the best comprehensive one-volume history of early modern and modern Japan now in print, but it is certainly a major candidate for that distinction.